

### ***Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary***

Application No.

10/036,345

<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
---------------------	--

WARDELL, MICHAEL JAMES

**Examiner**

Michael I Poe

Art Unit

1732

### All Participants:

**Status of Application:** Amended

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Wardell (Applicant).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 19 March 2004

**Time:** 2:45 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Claims discussed:**

3-10

Prior art documents discussed:

None specifically

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

### Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Michael Fox

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: potential rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for clarity; potential rejections over 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph for new matter; objections to the specification for minor informalities, missing reference numerals, and an improper "Brief Description of the Drawings" section; and objections to the drawing for not showing claimed details and minor informalities.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner sent proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance to the pro-se applicant for review and approval on March 19, 2004 (see attached). The examiner explained to the applicant that these changes were necessary to correct numerous problems in the application. First, the examiner explained that, although claim 3 appeared to be allowable over the prior art of record, claim 3 was not fully supported by the applicant's original disclosure and was replete with clarity issues under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. Due to the numerous problems with claim 3, the examiner proposed canceling claim 3 and added the newly proposed claims in the attached proposal. The examiner further stipulated that the newly proposed claims would better claim the applicant's invention and better set forth the coverage that the applicant was entitled to for his invention based upon the prior art of record. Second, the examiner stipulated that the drawings were not acceptable in the form currently presented. Based upon the examiner's review of the drawings, the examiner suggested the drawing change set forth in the attached proposal. These drawing changes would highlight the claimed features, eliminate minor informalities and put the drawings in better format for printing. Third, the examiner stipulated that the specification was replete with typographical errors, lacked the necessary reference numerals for claimed features, and did not provide proper descriptions of each individual drawings. The examiner stipulated that the changes in the attached proposal would eliminate these deficiencies. Fourth, the examiner stipulated that the abstract presented by the amendment filed on January 26, 2004 included a significant amount of new matter that was not supported by the applicant's original disclosure. Due to the amount of new matter and to make the abstract better reflect the applicant's invention, the examiner stipulated that the abstract had to be rewritten. As such, the examiner's proposal included a replacement abstract. Finally, the examiner stipulated that the title needed to be changed so that it better reflected the applicant's invention. After review the examiner's proposed changes, the applicant indicated that the changes were acceptable and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment in a telephone conversation on March 20, 2004. Refer to the attached proposal and the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.